



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,339	07/29/2003	Shiang-Kwang Chen	MR2561-128	6046
4586	7590	11/02/2004	EXAMINER	
ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE 3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101 ELLIOTT CITY, MD 21043			NGUYEN, CHI Q	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3635

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/628,339	CHEN, SHIANG-KWANG <i>SD</i>
Examiner	Art Unit	
Chi Q Nguyen	3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the claimed limitation is claim 8 is not disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because the citation “and thus the footrests being closer to tight on the top surface” is confusing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ku (US 6,694,691).

In regard claims 1, 4, Ku teaches a combination floor pad having composite base boards comprising a bottom plate 40 having a plurality of buckling nodes 21 arranged in lines with equal intervals on a top surface thereof, a plurality of footrests 30 having two slots 31 on two sides thereof, each slot 31 being arranged to fasten with a corresponding line of buckling nodes for the footrests closely combining with the top surface of the bottom plate, and each of the footrests 30 is out of wood material (see figs. 1-4, col. 2, lines 43-45, col. 3, lines 10-20).

In regard claims 2, 5, 8, Ku teaches the bottom plate 40 having a plurality of holes 41; the bottom plate 40 is made of plastic (col.2, line 47), and the bottom plate 40 having a plurality of drain holes 23 (fig. 2)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ku.

In regard claim 3, Ku teaches the structural elements for the floor as stated. Ku does not teach expressly the footrest is made of plastic wood instead of wood. Since the applicant's specification does not specify the plastic wood solved any stated problem. It would have obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have footrests made of plastic wood, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. The motivation for doing so would have been to have a lightweight floor structure.

In regard claims 6, and 7, Ku teaches the structural elements for the floor as set forth. Ku does not specifically teach a shape of the buckling node as rectangular block or a mushroom. It would have been obvious matter of design choice to have different shape for the buckling node or protrusion, since such a modification would have involves a desirable application.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ku in view of Wanzer (US 3,387,422).

Ku teaches the structural elements for the floor as discussed. Ku does not expressly teach a fastener for inserting object is a screw or a nail. Wanzer teaches a floor construction comprising a bottom plate 12, a plurality of floorboards or footrests 21 having two slots 24, and a plurality of fasteners 13 (see fig. 1). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ku with Wanzer for a plurality fasteners (screw or nail). The motivation for doing so would have been to provide more securement for the floor.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Summerford, Willis, Erwin et al., Bertolini, Yeh, Chun et al., Counihan, Montgomery, and Kessler teach floor system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Mon-Thu (7:00-5:30), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman can be reached at (703) 308-0839. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-

1113
CQN
10/18/04



Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600